

c/o Public Adviser, Margaret J. Kim

California Energy Commission

Re: Docket Nos. 03-IEP-01 and 03-RPS-1078

Docket Unit, MS-4

1516 Ninth Street

Sacramento, CA 95814-5504

03-IEP-1

DOCKET
03-RPS-1078

DATE MAY 03 2004

RECD. MAY 03 2004

To: Integrated Energy Policy Report Committee

Re: Accelerated Renewable Energy Development

Honorable John L. Geesman, Presiding Member

Honorable James D. Boyd, Associate Member

In response to the Homeland Security designation of nuclear power installations as "most vulnerable terrorist targets," and recognizing that all centralized power production facilities are similarly vulnerable, the 2004 IEPR might vision a mission to DECENTRALIZE CALIFORNIA'S ENERGY PRODUCTION.

A second essential mission is achievement of California and USA INDEPENDENCE FROM vulnerability to domestic and foreign MANIPULATION ENERGY AVAILABILITY and COST. Decentralization also contributes to realization of this mission.

Third and overriding goal is urgent action to further SUSTAINABILITY of LIFE on our planet by our mission to PROTECT OUR ECOSYSTEM from ever more pervasive degradation, and move our planning and action into the quality-of-life restorative mode, by acceleration of benign energy production.

This appeal to you is that you incorporate these goals in the 2004 IEPR, and that you establish the process---and the benefits to the utility companies, energy producers and to the consumers, to make the needed transitions NOW. "Long-term" must become "short-term." Our goals must not be just words on paper; they must be commitments to action, commitment to transition from the polluting/hazardous oil and nuclear production to the benign abundant sun/wind technologies et al.

Attn: Penny

INCENTIVE is the key! If the incentive is to buy certificates to satisfy percentage renewable requirements, then our purposes to provide more renewable energy are evaded

If we provide utility companies the incentives of higher profits and tax deductions from renewable energy, and from promotion of conservation--- and add public relations acclaim from government agencies and from non-profit community organizations, there will be enthusiasm and rapid transition to the benign energy production,

There must also be incentive to increase margins of supply.

COMPETITION is also an essential factor. When citizens who produce roof-top solar energy are locked in to big oil/nuclear utilities for three years, their goal to support clean/safe energy utility company providers is destroyed, unless it is somehow tied to phase-out of oil/nuclear.

There must be incentives for new independent renewable energy companies.

Our Federal Government has protected the costly oil/nuclear industries from competition from the abundant sun/wind producers, by providing billions of dollars in subsidies to destroy competition. For example, the monetary value of Price Anderson insurance, vast regulatory functions, the obligation for thousands of years caretaking lethal nuclear waste by-products---monitoring and replacement of containers, and for protection from terrorists, are all borne by the taxpayers, and not factored in to the published costs of nuclear power.

On April 5, in Senate committee record, Senator Dominici proposed yet another destruction of competition to be slipped into an "Internet Tax Non-Discrimination Act." Dominici said, "Obviously we need some kind of tax incentive to start up again the nuclear powerplant business in America."

Southern California Edison has just applied for permit to replace the steam generators of San Onofre, a 25 year life extender for the aging plants, and first step in the rebuilding of the nuclear installation. Obviously, Edison is confident that Dominici will continue to expand the incentive advantage---the uneven playing field for failed nuclear industry.

The foregoing comments address questions one and two. In the "how and when" of question 3, Please incorporate a major homeland security/energy independence educational campaign similar to the highly successful conservation campaigns of past times. Conservation can also be centerpiece of the 2004-2005 Integrated Energy Policy and the security/independence campaign.

Re: costs change, this comment is an appeal for new equity in the Energy Policy, regarding response to costs. In cost-benefit analysis, the unmeasurables of benefits of clean air, clean water, freedom from fear of terrorist hazards and hazards of mechanical and human failure, and freedom from thousand-year cost burdens on our progeny---quality of life benefits, must somehow be estimated in the balance. We must not continue down Dominici's road.

Identification and disclaimer:

The foregoing is my personal comment, as requested. I serve on the state energy committee of the League of Women Voters, but I do not speak for the committee nor the League in this statement. I serve on the steering group of CREED Coalition for Responsible and Ethical Environmental Decisions---a coalition of leaders of organizations and governmental agencies/councils, but this statement has not been submitted to CREED for approval.

I am originator of the Soroptimist International of Capistrano Bay initiative to promote roof top solar energy generation in the City of San Clemente, but I do not submit this statement as a representation of the opinions and goals of Soroptimist.

If comment can be produced by these groups before the May 10, deadline, it will be forwarded to the Commission.

Lyn Harris Hicken
3908 Calle Ariana, San Clemente,
Ca. 92672
949 492 5078